UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Thomas Paine—Peace Maker
- - - - - - - - *R. C. Roper*

The Dole, the Devil and the Deep Sea
- - - - - - - - *May Stranathan*

Ethiopia and India - *Jabez T. Sunderland*

Harry Ward Comes to Seattle - *Fred W. Shorter*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXVII NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 2, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3
Jottings—J. H. H. 6
ARTICLES—
Thomas Paine—Peace Maker—R. C. ROPER 6
The Dole, the Devil and the Deep Sea—MAY STRANATHAN 11
Ethiopia and India—JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND 13
Harry Ward Comes to Seattle—FRED W. SHORTER 14
POETRY—
Conscientious Objector—EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY 3
THE STUDY TABLE—
A Book by Our Poetry Editors—M. LOUISE GREEN 15
The Red Napoleon—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 16
A Thrilling Novel—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 16
Books Received 17
CORRESPONDENCE—
Outlawry of War and Sanctions—SALMON O. LEVINSON 17
Without Aid of Clergy—WINIFRED B. COSSETTE 18
Our Sacred Cows—ROBERT WHITAKER 18
THE FIELD—
Senator Copeland of New York Sponsors New Birth Control Bill—National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control 2
Germany and the News—Nazi Charges and the Official Figures—A Correspondent in *The Manchester Weekly* 20

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Senator Copeland of New York Sponsors New Birth Control Bill

Senator Royal S. Copeland of New York introduced into the Senate on February 12 a new birth control bill, S. 4000, designed to check pseudo-scientific and unreliable birth control information and to control indiscriminate distribution of birth control supplies. By modifying the restrictions imposed on licensed physicians by the present Federal statutes, the birth control bill will place the matter in the hands of the medical profession instead of commercial interests.

The new birth control bill will bring the Federal laws on contraception in line with the laws on the subject in more than forty states and with the spirit of the Constitution concerning states rights. Indicative of public opinion on this subject, more than forty states now permit physicians to prescribe birth control to their patients, but the Federal law is completely out of line with the laws of all states, with the possible exception of five. States rights of physicians and their patients in states which now permit the prescription of birth control information by physicians are nullified by the present Federal laws, which make it a penal offense to send contraceptive information or supplies by mail or common carrier, even to physicians.

In addition, the new bill would bring the Federal law on contraception in line with the decisions of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals and with the apparent policy of the United States Post Office Department.

The United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, "construes the whole phrase 'designed, adapted, or intended'" in the Federal laws on contraception "as requiring an *intent* on the part of the sender that the article mailed or shipped by common carrier be used for illegal contraception . . . or for indecent or immoral purposes."

The policy of the United States Post Office Department is not directed against the medical pro-

(*Continued on page* 20)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVII MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1936 No. 1

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR

I shall die, but that is all I shall do for death.
I hear him leading his horse out of the stall; I hear the clatter on the barn-floor.
He is in haste; he has business in Cuba, business in the Balkans, many calls to make this morning.
But I will not hold the bridle while he cinches the girth.
And he may mount by himself: I will not give him a leg up.

Though he flick my shoulder with his whip, I will not tell him which way the fox ran.
With his hoof on my breast, I will not tell him where the black boy hides in the swamp.
I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death: I am not on his pay-roll.

I will not tell him the whereabouts of my friends, nor of my enemies either.
Though he promise me much, I will not map him the route to any man's door.
Am I a spy in the land of the living, that I should deliver men to Death?
Brother, the password and the plan of our city are safe with me; never through me
Shall you be overcome.

—Edna St. Vincent Millay.

A STRIKE AGAINST WAR!

The more we think of it, the more surely we seem to feel that there is no way of preventing war except by the method of the strike. *War is wrong, and we will have nothing to do with it!*—how can we end this monstrous abomination except by believing and acting upon this principle? This is the conviction of the conscientious objector. He hates war as a sin, and goes on strike against it, either alone or in concert with his fellows. But why should the strike be confined to the young man called to military service? Why should we not *all* strike, and thus paralyze the government? The workers certainly should strike—as longshoremen and seamen have struck before this in the matter of handling and transporting munitions. If the workers, then certainly the ministers, who should thus refuse to bless the colors, to serve as chaplains in the regiments, or to do anything nearly or even remotely related to hostilities. Citizens generally should strike against the war by refusing to buy war bonds, or even to pay special war taxes. Women, as suggested centuries ago, might strike with enormous effectiveness by refusing to consort with their husbands, and maidens to marry, for the duration of the war. It all seems fantastic, perhaps—but no more fantastic, and certainly far less immoral, than denouncing war, hating war, outlawing war, and then participating in war whenever, in the interests of empire, war is precipitated by government. The end of slavery came in sight when men and women rose up in high resolve to have nothing to do with it, or with the government that sustained it under law. The end of war, we believe, will come in this same way. *War against war —even to the death!*

KAGAWA AND HIS HOSTS

We have a growing suspicion about Kagawa and the way he is being received and presented in this country. Kagawa himself seems suspicious, even unhappy. Twice to our knowledge, both in Washington and New York, he expressed objection to his entertainment at great dinners in luxurious golden banqueting halls. Right out loud, to his startled hosts, he cried, "I don't like this place. I belong in the slums." Also, we wonder what he thought when on a Sunday he stood in St. Bartholomew's Church, the richest church on the most stylish avenue in New York, the religious home of the swanks and snobs of the metropolis' most aristocratic set. We wish he might have read a few of his "Songs of the Slums" there, and rocked the edifice. Brooklyn did better in presenting him at the historic Plymouth Church, as simple and democratic as St. Bartholomew's is exclusive. But why should there have been any dealing with gorgeous hotels and still more gorgeous churches, where Kagawa's own followers in Japan could never have found admittance with him? We do not recall that when Gandhi went to London in 1931, he was received in this fashion. On the contrary, he spoke to London at the Friends Meeting House, and he was entertained at Kingsley Hall in the depths of the slums of Bow. But our suspicion of this affair runs deeper still. Why, to be perfectly frank, is Kagawa so definitely in the hands of churchmen? Why is he paraded around in the interest of a Christianity which has so largely betrayed the very ideals of social justice, human brotherhood, and world-wide peace with which Kagawa is identified? It is good strategy, perhaps, to get him into the houses of the Pharisees who need his message and must stand rebuked in his presence; but we doubt if such strategy was much thought of. Rather was

there the assumption upon the part of the proud and respectable in our churches that Kagawa belonged to *them* because he had at some time been converted to the Christian Gospel. And meanwhile, as usual, the people are left to pick up only such crumbs as fall from the masters' tables! Kagawa is brave and patient, and therefore will bear his cross; but there are signs that he knows he is on the Via Dolorosa.

AMICI NUNC HOSTES

The sound of broken crockery off-stage in a theatre is nothing as compared with the crash of broken friendships on-stage in politics. Splits seem to be the order of the day! Here is the split between "Al" Smith and President Roosevelt, the most sensational political event since Taft and the elder Roosevelt severed personal relationships. This split will undoubtedly widen as the campaign goes on, and in the end create a gulf into which the whole administration is likely to be precipitated in defeat. Then there is the split between William Green and John L. Lewis in the American Federation of Labor, which we discussed in these columns in our last issue. This division of forces will have political consequences, but primarily it will bring disaster upon labor. That at this critical moment, when the New Deal is crashing to ruin and with it all the enlightened labor legislation of the last three years, the workers should choose to fight among themselves is a tragedy of enormous proportions. Green's leadership is pretty bad, but it is statesmanship of the first order as compared with the bullheadedness of Lewis in precipitating this struggle. Another split of pitiful significance is that which has rent the Socialist Party in twain. It began with the adoption of the Detroit Platform which was not so much unwise as absolutely unnecessary. Why the leaders of the Party should have chosen this time to impose a hard-and-fast creed upon the membership, certain like all creeds to divide and destroy, passes all understanding. But there the Platform is, now doing its perfect work in fostering the intransigency of both wings, left and right, which are far more interested in annihilating each other than in annihilating the common enemy. Meanwhile, as one split follows another, the forces of reaction continue triumphantly consolidating their united front for the victory which looms ahead. One thinks inevitably of the rise of Hitler in a Germany clamorous with the contending cries of myriad divisions and sub-divisions and sub-sub-divisions of Social Democrats, Communists, and liberals. If Fascism comes in this country, it will be because the road of its advent has been made smooth for its feet by the contending factions of its foes.

WHAT DO THEY ALL MEAN?

Plans for passing 'round the money in this country are as abundant these days as huckleberries in a New England pasture. What do they all mean? That people have suddenly become looters and plunderers? It would seem so when one looks at the hungry hordes of the bonus grabbers. That people have all at once gone crazy? One might imagine so, to read the annals of the Townsendites. That political gangsters are abroad? Something of the sort was evident in Huey Long and his "Share-the-Wealth" slogan. But these and all other explanations seem to us to be inadequate, hopelessly inadequate, in the light of other and far more serious and nobler movements, such as Upton Sinclair's EPIC, and the Utopians. Involved in all these schemes, good and bad, sound and unsound, is a deep-rooted conviction in the public mind that there is something fundamentally unsound in the distribution of wealth in this country. The few have got far too much, the multitudes have got far too little, to be explained on any basis of justice or even common sense. Nor can personal qualities of initiative, ambition and ability, nor fortuitous circumstances such as opportunity or good luck, make head or tail of vast riches here and immeasurable poverty over there. There is a system at work, no doubt about that, which distributes production inequitably. The people are little by little uncovering this system, understanding its workings, comprehending its results, and resolving slowly but surely to change it. That the first proposals of change should be crude, clumsy, economically unsound, even out-and-out ridiculous, is inevitable. All reforms begin with the projection of wild chimeras. But the conviction is the important thing, the purpose and the high resolve, and this is all now aimed straight and sure at the sources of wealth in this abundant country and insuring its distribution unto all. Once these initial utopian stages are over, real statesmanship will come along, and then we shall see wealth and poverty ended forever. One thing is certain and that is that we are never going back to old days of *laissez faire,* but only forward to new days of plenty for all.

THE NAZIS AND ASSASSINATION

Julius Streicher, Jew-baiter of Nurnberg, declares that the assassination of the Nazi, Wilhelm Gustloff, in Switzerland, by the Jewish student, David Frankfurter, was not an individual but a group act. "The whole Jewish race," says Streicher, "must be brought before the court, for Frankfurter acted for his race." Well —*why not?* We have no use for assassination under any circumstances, and we think Streicher as wickedly wrong on this question as on every other. But, human nature being what it is, and Nazi Germany being what it is, why shouldn't we expect some Jews, driven to madness, to strike back for their race? Are these Jews bloodless that they should not feel, and here and there yield to, the passions of anger, outrage, horror, to which flesh is heir? Those who sow the seeds of

violence may not expect to escape in this imperfect world the reaping of the harvests of violence. The Bishop of Durham told the blunt truth when he said that those "ultimately responsible" for the assassination of Gustloff "are the present rulers of Germany. The German government's anti-Jewish policy," continued the Bishop, seemed "almost incredible in its senseless folly," and history would hold the leaders "primarily and mainly guilty of violences into which they have driven their victims." And who are these Nazis, after all, to object to assassination? Listen to this, as reported in the New York *Times*: Last November, in Kunau, Czechoslovakia, a Nazi named Karl Scheiterhauer shot dead a German Socialist refugee, Walther Rosensweig, and then fled to Germany where he was arrested. Immediately the Czechoslovakian Ministry of Justice demanded extradition, but, instead of complying, "the German authorities freed Scheiterhauer, who has since been appointed to a prominent Nazi party post." When Hitler demands in his newspaper, the *Voelkischer Beobachter,* that Frankfurter's crime "can be atoned for only by the severest punishment, namely by the death penalty," he may well be answered, as the Scriptures put it, "Physician, heal thyself." Let the Nazis stop their own murdering, and they may get a bit more sympathy when they themselves are murdered!

AMERICANS IN THE NAZI OLYMPICS!

It is with feelings of the utmost satisfaction that we have read of the perfectly stunning defeats which the American athletes have suffered in the Olympic winter sports in Germany. These defeats almost reconcile us to the participation of our athletes in the games. Had they been kept home, we would have had these pseudo-champions boasting for months of the victories they would have won, complaining of the loss of honor and fame visited upon themselves and their country, and in all probability, as Pegler points out in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, blaming the Jews for it all. As it is, they have had their shameful way, which has only brought them the shameful experience of the most consistent and overwhelming defeats ever administered to any American athletes anywhere at any time. Thanks to their own insistence, we know what "dubs" they are. The representatives of a nation of over a hundred and thirty millions of people, they have met the champions of little countries like Norway, Switzerland, Finland, and Sweden, which have total populations considerably less than the populations of more than one of our larger cities, and have been beaten and beaten and beaten again. It is to be remembered that this was only one of the exhibitions staged by our athletes. The first came on the opening day of the games when these so-called Americans paraded before Hitler, dipped the Stars and Stripes to the Swastika, and in general did honor to the Nazis. It is true that the skaters and skiers and bob-sledders, like Gamaliel of old, "cared for none of these things." They were just a crowd on a "bust," paid for by some one else, and "what the hell do we care"! But this participation in the Nazi festival was not the less a humiliation, and now it is matched by the humiliation of the defeats. Well, it is comforting to know that the shame will not be prolonged by any triumphal return to this country. Frederick T. Birchall, of the *Times,* suggests "a quiet entry by way of Quebec and the Grand Central Station." He says that this is being "seriously considered." We should think so! Stained by disgrace and stung by defeat, the quieter these athletes come home the better.

WOMEN IN HISTORY

Mrs. Mary R. Beard, co-author with her distinguished husband of *The Rise of American Civilization,* is disturbed by the neglect of women in history. There is no acknowledgment or just evaluation by historians, she says, of women's share in and contribution to world civilization. Women are either totally forgotten, or, if mentioned at all, are grievously misrepresented, even by such historians as H. G. Wells, Will Durant, and Harry Elmer Barnes. This is an indictment to be pondered, but it is doubtful if it will long hold water, not at least if present political tendencies continue. For on the very day that Mrs. Beard spoke her complaint, the widow of the late Huey Long was sworn in as successor to her husband in the U. S. Senate, thereby continuing a custom which seems to be becoming a tradition in American life. We doubt if many champions of woman suffrage in the old days ever imagined that one consequence of the reform would be that, when a politician died, his widow should be regarded as the heir not merely of his property but also of his office. But preceding Mrs. Long in the Senate is Mrs. Carraway, of Arkansas, whose only qualification for her position is that she was the wife of her late husband, the Senator before her. In the House are at least two women Representatives who sit as the monuments of their husband's memory. All of which we think is silliness raised to the nth degree! It's an example of American sentimentality at its very worst, and should be stopped before it is too late. Perhaps, in such a circumstance as this, we find a real explanation as to why even liberal and enlightened historians have so little to say about women. What, after all, have women ever done in the past except as wives, or mistresses, or servants, or slaves, of men? Here are women going into politics not on their own feet as individuals but as survivors or shadows of their departed husbands. Mrs. Beard herself writes a history not "on her own" but as partner No. 2 with her husband. Perhaps women will gain recognition as fast and as far as they are truly emancipated from masculine dependency.

Jottings

"Here is prophecy! If President Roosevelt gets rid of 'Jim' Farley, he will be re-elected in 1936; if he retains Farley in office, he will be defeated."—UNITY, Monday, December 2, 1935, page 127.

"Failure to ban politics from every post-office in the country will cost the President millions of votes in the next election."—Senator Norris, of Nebraska, on the floor of the Senate, February 6, 1936.

Well, well! Senator Norris must be a reader of UNITY!!

Church Calendar notice (Memphis, Tenn.):

"Dr. Holcomb will discuss 'If the Depression Has Disappeared, What Lessons Are We to Learn?'—Mrs. W. L. Walker will sing, 'Search Me, O God'."

"John Masefield, leaving, finds New York 'beautiful unspeakably'."—New York *Times*.

That word, "leaving," is significant. What if Masefield had to live in New York all the time!

We read that when J. Ramsay MacDonald made his reappearance in the House of Commons after his special election by the Scottish universities, he "was all smiles." Yes, "a man may smile and smile, and be a villain still"!

President Hoover prophesied that if Roosevelt were elected and his policies put into effect, *grass would grow in the streets.* President Roosevelt prophesied that if the AAA were declared unconstitutional, *wheat would go down to 15 cents.* Prophecy is dangerous!

George Seldes' book, "Sawdust Caesar," proves by documentary evidence that Mussolini is a blackmailer, a thief, a misappropriator of funds, a libertine, a murderer, and a coward. He was bribed by France to urge Italy's entrance into the World War; he stayed at home when the Fascists marched on Rome, and arrived only when everything was safe; he betrayed his friends, tortured and killed his enemies, and sold out his country. Hitler is a saint and a hero compared with this Italian thug. J. H. H.

Thomas Paine—Peace Maker

R. C. ROPER

The world longs to be saved from the malady of war. Clamors for peace arise on all sides. But before the health condition of peace can be attained, there must be a correct diagnosis of the disease itself. This is the day of research. Diagnose correctly the malady of war and its causes—then, patient research and intelligent experimentation will surely find the much-needed remedy that will insure to us the healthful condition of continued peace. Today no thinking person dares to say that the solution of any problem is impossible. All the way through the annals of mankind the so-called dreams of dreamers and idealists have slowly but surely taken shape and materialized.

More than one hundred and fifty years ago, Thomas Paine, in seeking the origins of the disease of war, found that in most cases of his day and before they lay in hereditary monarchy. To him, then, the remedy was simple—substitute representative democracy for hereditary monarchy.

This remedy was his own preparation. When he first prescribed it to the world, it was hailed as "a new system of politics as widely different from the old as the Copernican system is from the Ptolemaic," "as surprising a discovery in politics as the works of Sir Isaac Newton in philosophy."*

Paine was the enemy of a system, not of kings. Declaring that he was "not the personal enemy of kings," although he good-naturedly remarked that he would like "to see them all in a happy and honorable state" of private life, he boldly asserted—for it was boldness then to say it—that he was "the avowed, open, and intrepid enemy of what is called monarchy." He believed that if universal peace, civilization and commerce were ever to be the happy lot of man, they could not be accomplished except by a revolution in the system of government, founded "on a moral theory, on a system of universal peace, on the indefeasible hereditary rights of man, which promise a new era to the human race."

But the establishment of representative democracy, he believed, was not alone sufficient to avert war, if the representatives of the people were given the right and power to declare war. He, therefore, would vest the right to declare war solely in the people.

When Paine undertook to transfer government from the divine right of kings to the divine right of the people, and when he proposed representative democracy in lieu of hereditary monarchy, there were certain rights and powers which he felt should always be reserved exclusively for the people themselves to exercise. First among such was the right to make war. That power should not be vested in either the legislative or executive departments of the government, but should be retained and used only by the people themselves.

There are three things to be considered, declared Paine, in undertaking any war: "First, the right of declaring it; second, the expense of supporting it; and, third, the mode of conducting it after it is declared."

The right to declare war, he continued, should be where the expense must fall, and that is always on the people.

The mode of conducting a war, once it is declared, may be left "to the executive department."

"Were this plan to be followed out in all countries," he contended, "we would hear but little more of wars." Were governments required to order referenda on war before undertaking it, their peoples would at least have no one else to blame for madly engaging in it.

*Constitutional Review, Feb. 24, 1776, quoting "Diary of the American Revolution," 2 vols., by Frank Moore

Another principle in Paine's plan for peace, one which he stressed as of great importance, was the power of public opinion to prevent war. He thought, therefore, that we should organize a united world opinion to suppress recalcitrant nations.

Paine believed intensely in the power of thought. "A thought," he said, "is capable of becoming immortal and is the only production of man that has that capacity. . . Thought by some means or other is got abroad in the world and cannot be restrained, though reading may."

An idea "winds its progress from nation to nation and conquers by a silent operation. Man finds himself changed, he scarcely perceives how."

"An army of principles will penetrate where an army of soldiers cannot; it will succeed where diplomatic management will fail; it is neither the Rhine, the Channel, nor the ocean that can arrest its progress: it will march on the horizon of the world, and it will conquer."

Believing thus in the invincible power of thoughts and ideas and principles, Paine contended that if these could be organized into a united world opinion against war, no single nation could hazard the risk of opposing it. It was to his great credit, therefore, that he was among the first statesmen to urge this substitute for war: Arrange frequent international consultations to thwart war. Paine declared that "the most formidable weapon against error of every kind is reason." When war is threatened, he urged that nations "send ambassadors to form a General Council," in order that they might talk over their differences around the consultation table.

So strongly did Paine believe in the friendships of nations that he sought always to encourage alliances of peoples. He made a nice distinction between alliances of peoples and alliances of governments; the former he favored, the latter he opposed. First in our country to oppose "entangling alliances" of governments, he was first to urge an alliance of the people of America with the peoples of Europe to prevent war. There is no greater folly, he said, than counting on "treaties of alliance" between governments. "As soon as they have answered the immediate purpose of either of the parties they are but little regarded. Afterward, pretensions are never wanting to explain them away, nor reasons to render them abortive." The great principle of alliances seems to be little understood, he observed. No alliance can be operative that does not embrace within itself the real interests of the different peoples. An alliance of national interests is the only one that can be trusted and the only one that can be operative.

Paine was our first Secretary of Foreign Affairs. One hundred and thirty-seven years before his illustrious successor in the office of the Secretary of State negotiated the famous Bryan Peace Treaties, Paine had announced the principle that nations should negotiate treaties of arbitration.

In 1775 he said they should "lay aside the use of arms and settle matters by negotiation"; that nations, when differences arise among them, should "refer matters to arbitration instead of going to arms," since "peace, which costs nothing, is attended with infinitely more advantages than any victory with all its expense."

Paine was probably the first statesman of our country to favor the principle of The Hague tribunal for international adjudications. In *The Rights of Man* (1792) he endorsed the plan that nations submit controversies to a court of arbitration. He favored the idea that nations elect delegates "to act as a *court of arbitration* in any dispute that might arise between nation and nation." He expressed the optimism that "nothing in the political world ought to be held improbable," since that was "an age of revolutions in which everything may be looked for."

Paine even favored the arbitration of disputes affecting national honor, and in this he was far ahead of Theodore Roosevelt who placed a limitation upon justiciable issues when he said: "We despise the nation, just as we despise a man, who fails to resent an insult." Paine contended that such a spirit was sometimes provocative of war and that "national honor" thus "falsely understood is oftentimes the cause of war." He cited the instance of "the late Admiral Saunders declaring in the House of Commons, 'that the City of Madrid laid in ashes was not a sufficient atonement for the Spaniards taking off the rudder of an English sloop of war'." Such a spirit in private life, Paine observed, would be called "by the plain name of bullying. . . With how much more glory and advantage to itself does a nation act, when it exerts its powers to rescue the world from bondage and create to itself friends, than when it employs those powers to increase ruin, desolation, and misery."

His experience as one of our earliest diplomats had taught him that international tranquillity depends in large measure on "what might properly be called national manners," and that it is often best for nations "to pass over some things in silent disdain" than to act in disregard of "our peace and safety."

A century and a quarter before Norman Angell wrote *The Great Illusion* (1912), perhaps the most effective attack ever made upon the system of war, Paine had advanced its major thesis. He believed that the best way to stop war is to show that it is useless and unprofitable. Quite in line with this sentiment was that expressed by the late commander of the British army during the latter part of the World War, when he said, a short time before his death, that war benefits nobody except the profiteers, injures everybody, and settles nothing.

Anticipating these sentiments of the two great Englishmen, Paine had sought to convince the world that war is commercially unprofitable—especially to the victor nation. In support of this major proposition, Paine advanced certain arguments, which are developed at great length and reinforced with most convincing proofs in *The Great Illusion* by Norman Angell.

Paine made the strong point that the people of the victor nation do not share in the spoils of conquest. In the seventh number of *The American Crisis*, which Paine addressed directly "To the People of England," he asked:

"Suppose you had conquered America, what advantages, either collectively or individually, as merchants, manufacturers, or conquerors, could you have looked for? You must all pay toward the expense. The poorest among you must bear his share. Had America been conquered, you would have received no part of the land. Your taxes would not have been lessened. In the last war you made many conquests, but were your taxes reduced? On the contrary, were you not taxed extra for the cost of making the conquests, and has not the same been the case in every war?

"What inducement has the farmer, while following the plough, to lay aside his peaceful pursuit and go to war with the farmer of another country? What is dominion to him or any other class of men in a nation? Does it add an acre to any man's estate or increase its value?"

Another argument he put forth was that war does not benefit a trading nation. It can never be to the interest of a trading nation any more than quarrelling can be profitable to a man in business. To make war with those who trade with us, he declared, is like setting a bull-dog upon a customer at the shop door. The least degree of common sense shows the madness of the latter, and it will apply with the same force of conviction to the former.

Commerce does not follow the flag, contended Paine, just as did Norman Angell more than a century later. The idea of having navies for the protection of commerce is delusive; it is putting the means of destruction for the means of protection. Commerce needs no other protection than the reciprocal interest which every nation feels in supporting it. The per capita basis of measuring the benefits of commerce shows that nations without navies, or with only small ones are better off commercially than those with large navies.

The cost of conquests always more than absorbs the profits. Furthermore, the cost of maintaining dominion afterwards must be taken into consideration, Paine argued. The most unprofitable of all commerce, he declared in *The Rights of Man,* is that connected with foreign dominion. His contention is now most interestingly sustained by O. W. Wilcox's *Nations Can Live at Home* (just published as one of the Norton Social Action Books, edited by Alvin Johnson, head of the New School for Social Research), wherein it is stated that Italy entered the World War to enlarge her boundaries, gained 9,084 square miles of territory, incurred a war expense of $27,000,000,000, suffered casualties of 1,597,000 killed and wounded, and thereby paid 175 casualties for every square mile of territory gained, plus $4,276 in cash per acre. Whether Italy will do any better in her threatened Ethiopian conquest is yet to be seen.

There are few conquests, Paine declared, that repay the cost of making them, and mankind is pretty well convinced that it can never be worth its while to go to war for profit's sake.

Commercial supremacy gained by conquest defeats itself. Success by conquest always makes new enemies. The greatness of Louis XIV made all Europe his enemy, argued Paine. The same result will come to any nation that becomes too strong or too great. That nation is wise, he declared, which contents itself with the means of defense. The monarch or the minister who exceeds this rule knows but little of his business.

War benefits only the profiteers, continued Paine. That there are men in all countries who get their living by war, and by keeping up the quarrels of nations, is as shocking as it is true. Rumors of war will always be popular with these people, for war is their harvest, and the clamor which they keep up in the newspapers and in conversations passes unsuspectingly as the voice of the people.

War invariably means increased taxes. A few men have enriched themselves by jobs and contracts, but the groaning multitude have borne the burdens. War involves in its progress such a train of unforeseen circumstances, such a combination of foreign matters, that no human wisdom can calculate the end. But one thing is certain, and that is increase of taxes. The expense of every war has been double the expense of the war preceding it. Wars that could have been prevented have been madly gone into, and the result has always been debt and discontent. "I defend the cause of the poor, of the manufacturers, of the tradesmen, of the farmers, and of all those on whom the real burden of taxes falls—but, above all, I defend the cause of humanity."

One part of Paine's plan to prevent war is especially significant and distinguishes it from all others. Had it been followed by the Allied Governments after the World War in fixing the terms of peace against Germany and her allies, Europe would probably not now be facing another catastrophe. He contended that it is to the real interest of victor and vanquished alike to make treaties of peace just, of short duration, and provide for compulsory revision. As dark cumulous clouds hover over Europe today, in large measure the direct result of the unworkable peace treaty, the words of Paine are indeed prophetic:

"The seeds of almost every former war have been sown in the injudicious or defective terms of the preceding peace." Too often "the conqueror has insisted on too much and has thereby held the conquered, like an over-bent bow, in a continual struggle to snap the cord."

Perhaps the fittest condition that nations can be in to make a good peace, calculated for duration, declared Paine, is when neither is conquered and both are tired. He contended that it would be far better "to make all treaties of peace for a limited time" only.

Were treaties of peace made for and renewable every seven or ten years, reasoned Paine, the natural effect would be to make peace continue longer than it does under the custom of attempting to make peace forever. If a nation felt or apprehended any inconvenience under the terms already made, it could look forward to the time when it would be eventually relieved therefrom, and when it might renew the treaty on improved conditions.

This opportunity to revise or renew treaties of peace, and the realization of this right always existing in the nations, Paine believed, "would serve as a chimney" to "carry off the smoke and fume of national fire." It would take away the edge and occasion for fighting. Even if nations should at first determine on war, by the time the treaty expired, to go to war would be like fighting in "cool blood," and the "fighting temper" would have been dissipated before the "fighting time" arrived. Negotiations would supply its place. To know how probable this would be, a man need do no more than observe the process of his own mind in private controversies similar in nature to those among nations.

Of first importance as a cause of war, in the mind of Paine, were the restrictions placed upon commerce. Therefore, he sought to establish freedom of commerce by the removal of all trade barriers. So important is commerce to the peace of the world, Paine believed, that if it were permitted the fullest freedom, "it would extirpate the system of war." Commerce "is the greatest approach toward universal civilization that has yet been made by any means not immediately flowing from moral principles."

His reasoning was this: Whatever has a tendency to promote the civil intercourse of nations by an exchange of benefits among them is a subject as worthy of philosophy as of politics. Commerce is none other than the traffic of two individuals multiplied on a scale of numbers; and by the same rule that nature intended the intercourse of two, she intended it for all. For this

purpose she has distributed the materials of manufacture and commerce in various and distant parts of the world; and, as they cannot be procured by war as cheaply or conveniently as by commerce, she has rendered the latter the means of extirpating the former.

"Trade flourishes best when it is free, and it is a weak policy to attempt to fetter it." It is stupid, he argued, for one nation to seek to retard, diminish, or destroy the trade of another nation. Like blood in the human body, commerce cannot be taken from any part of the world without taking from the whole mass in circulation, and all nations therefore must share the loss.

To prevent a nation from selling is to prevent it from buying. Could the government of one country completely "destroy the commerce of all other countries, it would most effectually ruin its own." The prosperity of any commercial nation is regulated by the prosperity of the rest. If they are poor, she cannot be rich; and her condition, be what it may, is an index of the height of the commercial tide in other nations.

Another substitute for war is work. Paine was aware that idleness, on a large scale, among different peoples, is a frequent cause of war. He, therefore, believed that nations should provide gigantic domestic undertakings, equal in magnitude to that of war, to keep peoples busy and contented at home.

It is "the want of objects" to attract their activities, the lack of other things to do, that sometimes make peoples take up with "the rude and perpetual turn of war." So declared Paine. "Their time hangs on their hands without the means of employment." Their indolence affords "leisure for mischief," and large numbers, "being idle at once," they "are easily provoked to war."

If war is to be eliminated, however, then something must be put in its place for people to do. It must be something on as large a scale as war, as inviting and alluring, and must appeal to every man in the nation. That was the test fixed by Paine. Governments, he stated, may find "a thousand things to do which they did not have before." If that was true in his day, how much more so is it now. Instead of governments teaching their peoples "ideas of greatness in the rude achievements of the savage," why not teach them some of "the refinements of the gentleman," "the knowledge of the philosopher," 'the principles of society," and the blessings of "the arts, sciences, agriculture, and commerce"? Man would then be given something constructive to do that would arouse in him the spirit of imagination, initiative, and adventure, and his attentions would be mechanically withdrawn "from the pursuit of war."

In addition to the extension of world commerce, the development of agriculture, manufacturing, and other domestic enterprises, all of which Paine urged as substitutes for war, he thought governments should undertake to direct the activities and energies of their peoples in large-scale internal improvements: "great improvements and undertakings, such as inland navigation, building bridges, opening roads of communication" and various other "matters of public benefit." To do this, such enterprises should be undertaken with as great magnitude of man-power and wealth-power as war itself, so that they would "reach every man and give him something to think about and something to do."

Russia with her five-year plans and the United States with her regimented undertakings have thus far been able to keep their respective peoples diverted from the desire for war and conquest, and have at least made themselves less menacing to the world's peace than they otherwise might have been. They are too busy at home to want war.

Enforce economic boycotts against offending nations—this was one of the most important parts of Paine's plan to prevent war and preserve peace. He urged it as the most effective weapon of neutral nations in time of war.

"Commerce contains within itself the means of its own protection," declared this friend of world peace. In the summer of 1800, he prepared and submitted his "Maritime Compact" to all the Ministers of neutral nations then in Paris. It provided for "an unarmed association of nations for the protection of the rights and commerce of nations that shall be neutral in time of war," and was directed against England, to compel her to recognize as part of the law of nations "that free ships make free goods." The original draft of the document in Paine's handwriting was sent to Jefferson, who wrote (March 18, 1801) in his acknowledgment of its receipt that it had been published in the newspapers of America and also in pamphlet form under the name of Paine, adding: "These papers contain precisely our principles, and I hope they will be generally recognized here."

As an immediate and direct result of Paine's proposal, Emperor Paul of Russia, "in the month of September following the publication of the plan . . . closed all the ports of Russia against the ships of England." Other governments of Europe did the same. The ports of Denmark, Hamburg, Prussia, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, with the exception of Venice, were closed to England.

Describing the effect of the plan in operation, Paine stated that, except for the untimely death of the Emperor of Russia, who was President of the "Association of Nations," England would have been forced to acknowledge the principles of the Association as part of the law of nations, or otherwise lost her commerce.

The importance of this "league" of nations which Paine thus initiated and acually put into action, although unarmed and limited to the protection of the commerce of neutral nations in time of war, lay in certain very significant principles which it embodied, and which may well be considered seriously in these times of needed neutrality, when measures for effective impression upon recalcitrant nations are so much sought after.

His first principle was that in time of war neutral nations must act in unity. Alone and "individually," they "cannot resist" the unjust encroachments of belligerent nations upon neutral commerce, but acting under "a common system" for their own "self preservation," they can collectively prevent "the vexations and injuries to which the rights and commerce of neutral nations" are "exposed during the time of maritime war."

His second principle was that of peaceful boycott. The penalties provided in the pact, which were actually enforced, bound the signatory powers to refuse to "import," or to "permit to be imported" into their respective dominions, "any goods, wares, or merchandise, produced or manufactured in, or exported from, the dominions of the powers so offending against the Asso-

ciation." They refused "remittance of payment in money, merchandise, or bills of exchange" by "any of the citizens or subjects of any of the powers composing this Association, to the citizens or subjects of the offending nation . . . until reparation be made," which was to be three times "the amount of the damage sustained."

A third principle was the prohibition of "the transportation or exportation of military stores," etc.

Of great importance also was the provision that immediately upon the breaking out of a war, deputies were to be appointed by all neutral nations, whether members of the Association or not, "to meet in congress in some central place to take cognizance of any violations of the right of neutral nations." Here again was the application of the important substitute for war—consultations.

In passing, one touch of sentiment, such as often came cropping out of the acts of Paine, should be noted: The flag of the Association, which was carried at the mast-head "conjointly with the national flag of each nation composing this Association," was composed of the colors of the rainbow, arranged in the same order. This emblem testified eloquently to his life-long dream of blending nations as harmoniously as the colors of the rainbow into the Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World.

Establish an international police force. Paine was not willing to go the whole way with pacific policies only. He believed that force must sometimes be used, when all pacific means have failed, and thus anticipated the recent French Government's proposal for an international police force by urging a confederation of the navies of England, France, Holland, and the United States.

Although an English historian has said that Paine was "the real cause of the Revolution in America," yet he did not allow his feelings against England to swerve him from what he believed to be good for both countries. This proposal to confederate the navies was made only nine years after the American Revolution was ended.

The proposal was made, of course, as he himself declared, "without any direct authority on the part of America," but he said he had "good reason to conclude that she is disposed to enter into consideration of such a measure," provided it should be accomplished not merely among the respective governments but among the several peoples.

The objectives of Paine's proposal to confederate the navies of the United States, England, France, and Holland, were definite and highly important:

(1) To reduce taxes in the several countries.
(2) To permit the limitation and reduction of naval armaments.
(3) To create an international police force.
(4) To establish "the perfect freedom of the ocean."
(5) To enforce economic boycotts against all belligerent nations.
(6) To propose "with effect," "the independence of South America and the opening of those countries of immense extent and wealth to the general commerce of the world, as North America now is."

The above proposal for the confederation of navies to police the world and reduce armaments was made in *The Rights of Man* eight years before he organized the Association of Nations for the protection of neutral commerce.

In his discussion of the benefits of the confederation, he pointed out that after its accomplishment "the same fleets and armies would no longer be necessary" and that "the reduction could be made ship for ship on each side." He believed if the navies of these countries were confederated, the nations could propose "with effect, a limitation to, and a dismantling of, all the navies of Europe, to a certain proportion to be agreed upon," with the provisions:

"First, that no new ship of war shall be built by any power in Europe, themselves included;

"Second, that all the navies now in existence be put back, suppose to one-tenth their present force."

In thus proposing such a drastic reduction, Paine reminded them of the obvious though significant fact, for practical consideration, that the "relative" strength of each nation would still "be in the same proportion as it now is."

"If men will permit themselves to think," reasoned Paine, "as rational beings ought to think, nothing can appear more ridiculous and absurd, exclusive of all moral reflections, than to be at the expense of building navies, filling them with men, and then hauling them into the ocean to try which can sink each other fastest."

Support the League of Nations—so Paine would say were he living today, as a substitute for war and a preserver of peace.

"Neighborhood of Nations," "Association of Nations," "Unarmed Association of Nations," "Republic of the World," "Confederated Powers," "Confederation of Nations," "European Republic," "European Congress," "Congress of the World," "Pacific Republic," "The Revolution of the World"—all these expressions, taken from his writings, clearly show the trend of his mind toward cooperation, unity of action, and closer relations of all nations of the world. There can be no doubt that Paine was the first statesman of our country to favor a league of nations.

In this connection it is interesting to note that Paine did not overlook the important principle so tenaciously held by Woodrow Wilson—that of "self-determination." But Paine went farther than Wilson and applied the principle not only to each and every people, but to each and every succeeding generation of peoples. "One nation has not a right to interfere in the international government of another nation," or to dictate "what its form of government shall be."

Then as to the freedom of each generation: "Man has no property in man; neither has any generation a property in the generations which are to follow. Every age and generation must be as free to act for itself, in all cases, as the ages and generations which preceded it. The vanity and presumption of governing beyond the grave is the most ridiculous and insolent of all tyrannies."

The republic of the world—finally and ultimately, that was the goal of Paine's dreams as our first internationalist.

It is reported that at a dinner of a group of friends in London in 1787, Paine responded to the toast: "The Republic of the World." His sentiments were characterized at the time as "a sublime idea," more especially because at all times he had been "the inspirer of moderate counsels." He, of course, visualized the accomplishment of that ideal by an orderly evolution, never by bloody revolution.

The Dole, the Devil and the Deep Sea

MAY STRANATHAN

It seems to be the fashion nowadays in criticizing Federal relief to express the opinion that such work is not a proper function for the government but should be left to the churches and charitable organizations. Most emphatic is the governor of Georgia, who, according to newspaper reports, declared the Federal government is stifling religion by its relief activities, and that caring for the destitute should be done by communities through their religious organizations.

There are still many millions out of work, and there is no law in the land which would prevent any church or any other organization from keeping tab on the needs of the poor or feeding the hungry when the government fails to do so. Willard, Ohio, is not a large town and it seems incredible that the father of five children should have been out of employment there for years and the needs of the family not known to the churches or any relief organizations when the Federal relief had failed to care for it, until a boy of eleven must give up his pet rabbit for food and then hang himself. The government's extremity might well have been the church's opportunity in this case, and surely neither religion nor ordinary humanity need wait for complete breakdown of Federal relief before taking up the work.

There has been much criticism of Federal relief as being not only extravagant but necessary, doing more harm than good. Indeed, the Federal relief setup has called forth much criticism of relief in general, unless it be of the spasmodic kind which, on learning of the death of a child in want, hurries three automobiles loaded with food to the family. But recently I heard a young preacher say that a dole at its best kills the soul, while privation and want at their worst can only kill the body.

We were wont to hear the other side of the story mostly when the relief of the poor was left to the churches and private charities. Even yet we have "the hundred neediest cases" of the New York *Times* and other pathetic appeals during special drives for community chests. At such times it seems but right and proper to remind us that we have the poor always with us and to present their relief as a means of grace for those in more fortunate circumstances. And who or what stands more in need of grace just now than our government? Said Governor Talmadge to the New York Board of Trade at luncheon: "If the Government keeps on handling relief, manicuring ladies' nails and giving people cars to ride around in, it will stifle religion in this country. You cannot live up to the Word of God by going to church on Sunday and singing a song. If you do not help till it hurts, then religion dries up in your soul." Surely our government is giving till it hurts, or at least it will hurt sooner or later. And who doubts that a dose of religion would be good for the government?

It is well to remember that a dole is a dole, whether it comes from the government, the churches, the associated charities, the Salvation Army or any other relief setup. In much of the criticism of Federal relief there lurks a prejudice against the elimination of poverty as an aim of the state. Can it be that the eternal presence of the poor is still regarded as a dispensation of an All-wise Providence, designed for the preservation and cultivation of the spirit of benevolence in the thrifty at the expense of the cultivation of thrift and independence in the needy? Was the command to sell all his goods and give the proceeds to the poor given to the rich young man only for his own salvation and with no regard for the best interests of those on whom his gifts were to be bestowed? If so, perhaps it was just as well that he went away sorrowful, instead of doing like the young woman who, concluding that her jewels were dragging her down to hell, gave them to her sister.

Some years ago in Pittsburgh two charitable organizations quarrelled over the territory each should cover in their good work, members of one organization resenting the other doing anything for the relief of the poor they considered their own special care. They claimed to know just how much relief the neighborhood could stand without being pampered. A few days ago I heard a woman say that since she had been taking care of an invalid relative she had escaped boredom, had been in much better spirits and enjoyed a feeling of satisfaction in doing good. But in the judgment of mutual friends the relative would be much better off both physically and mentally if he were not so well cared for but forced to exert himself. Even thus the blessedness of self-sacrifice is often discredited.

How often we hear the objection to the modern jubilee programs for sharing the wealth, that it would be but a short time till all the money, or property, or food, or clothing were back again in the hands of the former owners. This would seem really to be the best of arguments for getting the money into circulation by increasing the buying power of the forgotten man, who would, as usual, spend it not wisely but too well, unless restrained by some as yet unknown device. This would also contribute to the preservation and cultivation of the rugged individualism of the money-changers, who would be but temporarily deprived of their wealth and would have the fun of winning it all back again, thus escaping the boredom which is fabled to accompany great riches too long continued.

Yet even this short season of competence might eternally ruin the poor. I remember that, when pensions for widows with minor children were first proposed in Pennsylvania, one man's argument against them was that the finest men and women he knew were the children of a poor widow, that the struggles and hardships of their early lives had strengthened them for the battles of later life, and it would weaken the characters of both widows and orphans for the state to help them. Following this argument to its logical conclusion we must decide that the better father a man is the worse he is, that any father, except perhaps the worthless one who does not provide for his family at all, is a drawback to his children and should be eliminated even if the state has to pension him to desert them. Another argument, made in all sincerity by the head of the city nursing staff, was that in the hill district where she worked, there would not be a father left if the mother's pension bill passed. She affirmed that so hard were the conditions of life there that nothing but the thought that his family would starve, should he decamp, kept the man on the job. This was in the days long before the latest, lingering depression struck us.

In those days, too, returning visitors to England told us of the poverty there, a poverty in evidence even on

the most fashionable streets, where beggars thronged. We heard sociologists explain this situation as the result of so many richly endowed charities in England which had fostered idleness and dependence through many generations, so that now entire families had no longer any ambition higher than to be kept at the expense of others.

In any case the greater blessing remains always with the giver, according to the Scriptural saying that it is more blessed to give than to receive, though objectors to the inheritance and income taxes need yet to be convinced of this truth. Is it possible that the criticism of the Federal plans for putting to work the forgotten man has its subconscious origin in the fear that we might somehow in the end muddle through to the elimination of poverty, and, by cutting off his means of grace through giving, make it impossible for the rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, instead of its only being harder than for the camel to go through the eye of the needle?

Years before Federal Prohibition was tried, I heard Margaret Deland say that those who advocated Prohibition by law ignored the fact that temptation is necessary to teach us to overcome evil, that perhaps the saloon is needed to develop moral courage in the young man obliged to pass it. The same argument might be used for the placing of saloons, gambling joints and houses of ill-fame in the path of all young men and women, or adjacent to churches for the trial of the characters of all church-goers. Such as resisted temptation might glorify God by a sort of "Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated" arrangement. Familiarity with vice does sometimes breed contempt, but even oftener, perhaps, we first endure, then pity, then embrace.

True, we cannot resist temptation when there is no temptation to resist and it is only by contrasting it with evil that we know good. This same line of reasoning was the basis of the action of the preacher of an older generation who followed his missionary sermon with a prayer of thanksgiving that he and his hearers were born in a Christian land. This view, carried to the extreme point, culminates in the words of Jonathan Edwards in regard to the enjoyment of heaven being enhanced by contemplation of the torments of the lost in hell.

Thus are good and evil hung in the balance over against each other by way of contrast. Perhaps it is just this absence of evil in the pictures of heaven that makes it appear so insipid and uninteresting a place. Emerson speaks of the satisfaction of waking up in the morning and finding the old familiar things around him—even the dear old devil himself. We would all miss him more than we think, could he be annihilated. But there seems to be no immediate danger of that.

In these days of many doctrines pushed to the point of absurdity, the old saying that there can be too much of a good thing becomes more and more apparent. To those who have seen even virtues pushed to the point where they begin to backtrack and resemble vices, how desirable becomes the Greek sense of proportion, and how sane the admonition to keep in the middle of the road. Casuistry seems the rule today in politics as well as in everything else. Or shall we call it the higher pragmatism? A thing is good as long as it works, but becomes bad as soon as it fails. We are converted to the belief that there is no sharp dividing line between good and evil, merely a hazy, nebulous and shifting border. Was it not Balzac who held that pain was but a more exquisite pleasure? Are those who make no compromise with evil the short-sighted ones?

There remains the old dispute among literary critics as to whether Satan is not the real hero of *Paradise Lost,* whether Roderick Dhu in the *Lady of the Lake* is not a more attractive man than Alan Graeme, and lovers of Stevenson declare the Master of Ballantrae is not nearly so interesting a character as his daredevil brother until he allows his hatred for him to dominate his life. This tendency in human nature explains the attraction of the adventurer in "the bright face of danger," sins and all. The good mother was so overdone for so many years that she has now become the favorite villain of the novelist.

The doctrine of non-resistance suffers from seeming to swing too far past the dividing line between good and evil. Can the admonition to resist not evil but overcome it with good be pushed to the point where it ceases to be a virtue and becomes the casting of pearls before swine? There used to be a young lawyer in Pittsburgh who, during the propaganda craze for the World War, was accused of being a Communist because of his pacifist utterances. The matter was taken up by the local bar association. In trying to make his pacifist principles consistent, he asserted, in answer to questioning, that were his wife attacked he would not defend her by physical force but would try moral suasion on the villain. On the strength, or weakness, of this testimony, Mr. Margolis was disbarred for some years and may still be, for all I know, though he was known as an able and fearless defender of the poor and friendless in the courts.

I could understand the words of President Wilson when he said we were "too proud to fight," though the words were ridiculed and made to appear as an excuse for weakness and fear by war propagandists. But there does seem something weak in extreme meekness, and this despite the saying that "the meek shall inherit the earth." Nor could I ever think of Moses as the meekest of men, for even in his dealings with the Almighty he could be goaded to rebellion and plain talk, to say nothing of his killing the Egyptian in his early manhood.

The saying of Jesus about giving your cloak to the man who would sue you at the law and take away your coat, and about going two miles with the man who compels you to go one mile, evidently seems the height of absurdity to the most of us, his professed followers as well as others. I have never heard a preacher frankly discuss these commands and I doubt if they are taken seriously even by the clergy. If they are discussed in the theological seminaries the fact seems to be a well-kept secret. If put into practice they would, in the opinion of mankind in general, destroy all laws and order and encourage crime. Not long since I heard two women, both professed followers of Jesus as a divine teacher, speak in the highest praise of the statement of a writer that the man who suffers a legal wrong, without seeking to bring the lawbreaker to justice, is as guilty as the lawbreaker in encouraging crime.

Despite the general opinion in a land of churches that to try to resist not evil but to overcome it with good would destroy the social order of civilization, who can doubt that what Jesus had in mind when he gave these commands was the transforming of men into divine anarchists? Evidently Paul recognized this pur-

pose when he declared the law not made for righteous men, but for the disobedient, agreeing in this with Thomas Paine when he says in *Common Sense:*

"Society in every state is a blessing, but government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state, an intolerable one: for when we suffer or are exposed to the same miseries by a government which we might expect in a country without government, our calamity is heightened by the reflection that we furnish the means by which we suffer.

"Some writers have so confounded society with government as to leave little or no distinction between them; whereas they are not only different but have different origins. Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness. The former promotes our happiness positively by uniting our affections; the latter negatively, by restraining our vices."

Law enforcement is generally conceded the best and only means of bringing about a state of society approaching perfection, but, despite the enigmatical admonition to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and the story of the driving of the money-changers out of the temple, both the commands of Jesus and his actions plainly show his devotion to the principle of non-resistance. We have not gone very far toward perfection with all our laws, our lawyers, our courts, our fines, our jails and our lawful killings. It even seems sometimes that we are progressing backwards.

We may lay claim to intuitive knowledge that the doctrine of non-resistance is the better and only way to a perfect peace, but experience with persons claiming divine inspiration has taught us that intuitions, even religious ones, must be analyzed, clarified and confirmed by the intellect before they can be safely preached. Is the doctrine of resisting not evil but overcoming it with good only a dream too pure and good for human nature's daily food, or is it an eternal truth from which there is no escape—a truth announced by the greatest genius the world has ever known? Is its application the transforming of genius into practical power which Emerson says the world exists to realize, and the bringing to full circle the spiritual laws of the universe for which he hoped?

If it be the latter, are there not left on earth enough sturdy individualists who have the faith to venture it a trial? If not, how are we to justify the Christian church machinery with which a great part of the earth is now honeycombed, and the church buildings which predominate in every city and hamlet of Christendom? If there be not enough believers in the teachings of Jesus to risk all worldly considerations in bringing about a new era, then we have no reason to resent it when the prophets of Baal turn upon the Elijahs of this day and generation and throw in their teeth his words of mockery:

"Cry aloud, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked."

Ethiopia and India

JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND

Amid the political confusion and darkness of the world, one clear beam of light appears. It is the interest which practically all the nations of the world are showing in the freedom of Ethiopia,—their denunciation of the attempt of a foreign power to conquer her and reduce her to bondage. This seems to mean, does it not? a growing political conscience among the nations—a growing sense of the sacredness of national freedom and independence.

But why should this interest in freedom and this disapproval of bondage be confined to Ethiopia? Why forget the terrible and long-standing bondage of a nation far greater and more important than Ethiopia?

The author of this article believes that the world's greatest wrongs and crimes today are two—first, War, rising in horror, expense and folly high above all the others; and, second, the forced bondage of India, a great, cultured, historic nation, with an illustrious past of 2,500 years and containing one-fifth of the population of the globe.

Just what does India's bondage mean? Is it less serious, less criminal, than that with which Ethiopia is threatened? Let us ask a distinguished and impartial authority—a *British* authority.

A short time ago, Miss Madeline Slade, a highly educated and accomplished English lady, the daughter of a British admiral, who had moved in the highest social and political circles in both England and India, came to America for a visit of some weeks. While here she gave by request several addresses, in New York, Boston and other cities, on India, where she had spent many years. Here is a part of what she said :

When the British came, India was a country with great wealth, and a healthy peasantry. Of its 350,000,000 people, three-fourths are agricultural; but in India agriculture cannot be carried on during the whole year. The people needed a subsidiary occupation to follow during the months when it is impossible to work in the fields. From time immemorial, this occupation had been the making of cloth. India made all the cloth for its own wearing, and sold large quantities abroad. What they gained by agriculture, added to what they earned by cloth-making, enabled the people to live in simple comfort.

In order to make of India a great market for British cloth, the British government deliberately destroyed India's own cloth-making industry. You can read in the history books how it was done. Since then, the peasant cultivators who make up the bulk of the population have been unemployed during a part of the year. They have grown poorer and poorer, until they are chronically half starved, and have become so enfeebled that the average length of life has dropped to 23½ years. In India the average income is two pence a day; and to get even that average you have to include the incomes of all the millionaires.

There is terrible child mortality. You have been told various fairy tales to account for this, but the great reason is poverty. There are millions of Indians who never taste milk after they are weaned. Mothers will nurse their children three and four years. because they know that afterward the children will get only rice water or pea-soup. There is an appalling contrast between India as she was and as she is; and the change has all come about in 150 years, under British rule. England's whole wealth and prosperity are built up on the blood of India.

I know whereof I speak. My father was the British naval commander-in-chief. We lived in Bombay, in great pomp. I saw the enormously top-heavy Indian civil service, the most extravagant and costly in the world. I saw the Viceroy, living like a mighty emperor. Since then, for nine years, I have lived among the poor and have seen the destitution of the starving peasants, by whom all that pomp and luxury must be paid for. I have known the inside of life in India—both sides of it.

The British Government has framed a new Constitution for India. What is its nature? Does it give the Indian people freedom from the bitter bondage described by Miss Slade?

The framers of the Constitution represent it to

the world as something very generous, honorable and noble on the part of Great Britain; as a great boon to India; as giving her a large measure of freedom at once, and advancing her far on the road toward full freedom, that is, self-rule.

What do the Indian people answer? Except those who are tied to the Government by government favors or government pay, absolutely all parties and all classes, with hardly a dissenting voice, declare that these representations are the exact opposite of the truth. They deny that the new Constitution is a boon to India, or generous, or honorable, or just, or worthy of England. They declare that, while making certain changes in the government that have some appearances of freedom, it does not give the Indian people any real freedom at all (they are allowed to do nothing outside of British control); it does not advance them one inch in the direction of real freedom (self-rule); it does not promise (promise in a way that means anything) that they will be given self-rule, even Dominion Status, in a thousand years. The Indian people are indignant, not only that such an unjust and tyrannical constitution should be forced on them, but also that the world should be made to believe that they are getting "bread," when they are getting only "a stone,"—that they are getting "a fish," when it is really "a serpent." India sees clearly now that Lloyd George's words were true, that the new Constitution is a "steel frame" *to hold Britain's valuable "possessions" more firmly than ever in her power,* and, everything seems to indicate, *permanently* in her power.

What-exactly, are the central features of the new Constitution? They are the following five:

1. Under the new Constitution the *army* in India is to be wholly under the control of the British. India cannot command or control a single soldier.

2. The immense *police forces* (100,000 strong) are to be wholly under the control of the British. India cannot command a single policeman.

3. Under the new Constitution, the British are to retain full control of *India's foreign relations.* The Indian people are not to be allowed to send an ambassador, or a consul, or a commission, or agent of any kind, to any nation. They are not to have a place in the world as a nation at all. Their place is to be the humiliating and degrading one of a "dependency," a "possession" of a distant power.

4. Under the new Constitution, the British are to have absolute control of India's *national finances.* Of all the taxes collected and all other public revenues, the Indian people are not to be allowed to spend a rupee, except as permitted by their British masters.

5. Worst of all under the new Constitution, the *Viceroy* is to be an *autocrat,* an *absolute monarch.* He is to be wholly outside the control of the National Indian Legislature or the Indian people. He can veto any law and thus destroy it; he can enact (by "certification") any law or ordinance, he pleases, in defiance of the whole nation. This has been done repeatedly by present and past Viceroys; now the Viceroys are to have even more power, and power that is even more autocratic.

How free would England be if her army, and police, and foreign relations, and national finances were all under the control of Japan, or Germany, or America, and if she were ruled by a Japanese, or German, or American Emperor or Governor, with autocratic and absolute power?

Ours is a Christian civilization. Is is not fitting to call to mind the words of him whom Christians are supposed to serve:

"He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captive, and liberty to them that are bound."

And also these other New Testament words?—

"Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them."

And not less these words of our honored American poet, James Russell Lowell:

Whenever a wrong is done
To the humblest or the weakest, 'neath the all beholding sun,
That wrong is done to us, and we are slaves more base,
Whose love of right is for ourselves, and not for all the race.

Harry Ward Comes to Seattle

FRED W. SHORTER

Harry F. Ward spoke recently to four thousand people in the Seattle Civic Auditorium. That may seem a simple occurrence, but to those of us who know what happened behind the scenes it was significant—in at least two ways. It was a triumph for freedom of assemblage, and it marked a great gain in the cementing of the liberal forces in united action against the reactionary powers that have for long succeeded in cowing Seattle citizens.

For weeks it was very uncertain whether Ward would have any meeting at all. The large downtown churches were afraid to have him. The school authorities refused a high school auditorium. To make matters worse, the liberal groups which Ward represented were not unified. Ward, in the words of one man, is a "hot potato." He is a hot potato because he is the embodiment of a united front, and so far few communities have united their liberal groups, Seattle least of all. He is secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, national chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union, and national chairman of the League Against War and Fascism. That makes him very embarrassing to those who have not yet accepted the idea of a united front. The Methodists here did not want anything to do with either the Civil Liberties Union or the League Against War and Fascism. The Civil Liberties group did not want to be mixed up with the League. But you cannot divide Ward, like Gaul, into three parts. You either sponsor him or you do not. If you sponsor him, you are at least giving aid and comfort to all the groups which he represents. What to do? Each group wanted him heard. It would be foolish to have three public meetings. Finally some one hit upon the idea of a "sponsors' committee" of private citizens which would include members of these various organizations. The committee was formed and, failing to obtain a private hall, the Civic Auditorium was engaged.

Not one of the committee dreamed that before the night of the meeting all Seattle would be talking about this man Ward. The Hearst morning paper fired a blast about this "red" professor. It exposed all his nefarious connections and especially his connections with those organizations which give "aid and comfort" to Communists. It insinuated that he would advocate the overthrow of our cherished American institutions. It related with gusto how he had been refused the downtown First Methodist Church, and quoted the minister to that effect. Were the citizens of Seattle going to allow this dangerous radical to speak in their tax-supported auditorium? Patriotic legionnaires and daughters rushed into print with resolutions. They sent committees to the mayor to demand the cancellation of the lease. The mayor was jittery. He had

several interviews with the committee. Probably one consideration finally swung him to deny the patriots' demand. He is running for re-election and his strongest opponent is putting civil rights as the main plank in his platform. Only recently the mayor had been accused of encouraging a vigilante raid upon a workers' school. Whatever his motives, he let the lease stand with a statement to the press that if Harry Ward advocated the violent overthrow of the government he would have him arrested on the spot.

On the sponsoring committee were four professors of the University of Washington. The Hearst paper attacked these men viciously. Fortunately for them, a teachers' union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor had been recently organized. They appealed to members of the union for support. Fifty-eight responded. The Hearst paper then got an interview with the president of the university, Lee Paul Sieg, recently from Pittsburgh University. Sieg rapped the professors with the statement that they ought to be busy with their class work and not fritter away their time on such community matters as the Ward meeting.

Suddenly, like a bolt out of the blue, came a smashing front page editorial in the *Star,* a Scripps-Canfield paper. It was a masterly defense of the right of the people peaceably to assemble. Under the editorial were published the names of the fifty-eight professors, with an invitation from the editors for others to join, and a promise that the list would be republished with the new names added.

The result was that people who had never heard of Ward came out to see and hear him. They were surprised to see a mild little man with kindly twinkling eyes and an engaging smile. Instead of hearing the advocacy of the overthrow of the government by force and violence, they heard a revealing and convincing discussion of methods by which big business interests now actually do, in certain localities, overthrow the government by force and violence. Adroitly he pleaded with legionnaires who were present to defend the heart of the Constitution, the bill of rights. He made many see for the first time the necessity of a "people's front" which would take in all people "as far to the left as they would go and as far to the right as they would come."

Out of the meeting came the formation of a city-wide "Committee for Social Education," membership in which is to be as inclusive as Ward suggested. Its purpose is to inform Seattle citizens by means of great town meetings and to preserve the rights of free speech by using them. Ward has been a tonic for Seattle. He was an unpleasant dose for some and, for many, too nasty to take. Most of the ministers of the city refused to take it. Although he had conferences in the Y. M. C. A., to which all ministers of the city were invited, there were very few in attendance. Most of those who were there appeared as confused as Clifford Odet's family in *Paradise Lost,* as to the real social issues facing them and their churches. But Ward is a genius at clarifying problems. The reverberations of his visit will be heard in pulpit and pew for a long time.

The Study Table

A Book by Our Poetry Editors

SIERRA DREAMERS' HOUSE. *By Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney. Philadelphia: Poetry Publishers. $1.00.*

Again these "architects of castles in the clouds and dreamscape gardeners" delight us with an invitation to Dreamers' House, where "life is always radiantly begun. . . . Where reality and dream are one." We learn from gardeners who have planted and watched it grow to bloom, that truly "Home is a flower whose fragrance is peace."

Here we are refreshed by the moist fanning of a "fountain . . . that shimmers like a fairy wing"; we know the brilliant air and singing fire of Sierra "jewels so vibrant they came alive." There are moments "dearly daft" with laughter, jubilant moments; "moments lustrous as a river That stirs to music with silver, lapping tongue"; and a hushed "hollow hour" when we breathe the sacred atmosphere of love's incense burned on the shrine of immortality. . . .

"No shores may hem the spirit tides begun." We find ourselves drawn into arms of sympathy by "Two on the Shore" who have discovered that larger love free of itself, and have exclaimed:

> "Our passion should enlarge, not narrow, view.
> As we embrace, then let us tightly hold
> The world itself as though it were our child."

In the conviction that "Truth is a bugle sounding A challenge to things as they are," these poets utter a "Cry for Brotherhood"; sing a "Song of the Unremembered"; warn the materialist that "Someday it will crumble, your strong redoubt"; and in behalf of the "battle line of dreamers . . . who dare To take the road of truth against despair," they send a word ahead to readers in ages hence:

> "Listen, my friend, and hear the echoed tread,
> Of spirits marching who are never dead,
> Of men and women who had love to give
> That fathered the better age in which you live."

Ever championing the poet, the Cheyneys herald expectantly

> "The dream-paved city poets build,
> Where hearts as well as hands are skilled."

It is *faith*—the undertone and overtone of these songs—that lends them a harmony whose echoes have a lasting sweetness. We hear the ecstatic declaration,

> "Though every lance of failure plow us under,
> We lift our eyes to love's untarnished wonder."

It is the same glimpse of a "brotherly city hid in a blur" that keeps melody strong—the sustaining tone—in these songs.

Not unmoved but undaunted, facing "the thunderous riots Mankind must pass before the new dawn breaks," the poets bravely sing and, peering through and beyond, send back the exulting call:

> ". . . . see! there is light in the east again
> And hope in the morning's womb."

The final movement of the symphony from *Sierra Dreamers' House* is a fusion and a fountaining of *joy*—joy lifted free in a vision where

> ". . . . transfigured with rapture, each soul
> Is a taper that burns on a shrine
> To the glory and grace of the whole . . ."

M. LOUISE GREEN.

The Red Napoleon

STALIN. *By Henry Barbusse. New York: Macmillan Company. $3.50.*

Russia's first lord of the Council, democratic dictator and Red Napoleon, supplies a capital protagonist for Henry Barbusse's splendid new spectacle of U. S. S. R.—through the eyes of this one man we see full-length his Communist Commonwealth in action, working, playing, fighting, laughing, loving, doing the thousand and one things which render it perhaps the most portentous of all present day phenomena. Platitudinous to declare, no doubt (but also undeniably pertinent), against a world in arms, Soviet Russia *is:* and that fact, together with all implications for futurity, justifies some little discussion concerning this latest drama of its rise to world empery.

Born in Czardom's Georgian wilderness about 1879, joining the Marxist revolutionary movement in the early nineties, Joseph Visarionovitch, alias Stalin, found himself launched forthwith upon the tidal wave which, carrying before it the debris both of czardom and of capitalism, was destined eventually to transport him to the fiery heights. On the way, however, he had to do battle with almost innumerable enemies, and to undergo, successively, exile, imprisonment, as well as widespread persecution. Meanwhile, the torrent surged on its irresistible way forward, dominated by the colossus called Lenin, Danton and Robespierre of Bolshevism, dictator of dictators. Seemingly dammed up until 1914, world catastrophe now takes a hand in the business, with the result that, bursting its flood-gates, the Revolution comes to climactic apotheosis in a series of stirring events: the downfall of Czarist despotism; ascendancy of the Girondist Kerenskyites; Kornilov's coup, understudying Dumouriez and bringing about their overthrow; *Ten Days that Shook the World;* seizure of Russia's helm by the Mountainist Bolsheviki, with Lenin at their head; another radical republic fighting for life against encircling allied armies, winning its right to live through flame, famine, frenzy—rising above it all, Stalin and Lenin warring cheek by jowl for the beseiged fatherland and the world revolution, inciting their hosts to feats of almost supernatural valor. Then, the foreign foe defeated, hurled back beyond the frontiers, Lenin's death and transfiguration, followed by the fall of Trotzky, "the faux Napoleon," making way for the true, the Revolution incarnate, personified in Joseph Stalin, Russia's man of steel, who, slowly forging his way to the front in the Communist council, gathers all power within his hands, and then, unleashing Russia's enormous resources in a swift series of Five-Year assaults, drives that nation along its earth-shaking road, grinding fascism, capitalism, and imperialism beneath the wheels of his victorious chariot, heralding by his standard the new dawn, the brotherhood of man, the federation of all workers in the cause of humanity.

Such is the spectacle as M. Barbusse has portrayed it; and its myriad details, its profound social implications, are too far-reaching to be more than hinted at. What of the man? Strong yet flexible as steel itself (like his pseudonym), of "formidable intelligence, breadth of knowledge," "amazing orderliness of mind"; his "passion for precision," his "inexorable spirit of progress," "the rapidity, sureness, and intensity of his decisions," and, illuminating and heightening it all, his childlike gaiety and simplicity of soul—these are the qualities which have placed Joseph Stalin at the wheel of U. S. S. R., the second great master soul dominating Russia today, watched over and guided in his mighty course by the sleepless spirit of Lenin.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

A Thrilling Novel

FRESH FURROW. *By Burris Jenkins. 257 pp. Chicago and New York: Willett, Clark & Co. $2.00.*

Here is a perfectly thrilling novel, especially for those who enjoy unique love stories. The minister of Linwood Community Church in Kansas City, Missouri, certainly can concoct a plot fascinating for enthusiasts of modern intriguing tales. His serious purpose is to present the Cooperatives with the Rochdale principles as the means of solving our economic crisis. The publishers tell us that the incidents woven into a story around the hero, Dennis Burns, are factual, and that the scene in Washington at the time of the forming of the Oil Codes under NRA actually took place as recorded.

In our judgment the claim of the publishers that this "is the Uncle Tom's Cabin of the Cooperative movement in America" is justified by both content and the importance of the movement it hails. It does lack the breadth of emotional appeal of Harriet Beecher Stowe's masterpiece, perhaps inevitably, since certainly it has yet been impossible to claim that the farmers of the Middle West ever sank so deeply in the mire of suffering as did the negroes under cruel slave-owners. However, it is thrilling to read how many farmers and others in Dr. Jenkins' part of the country have found at least a partial way out of the economic dilemma of capitalism's collapse.

The story of Denny Burns coming home from the Great War to find his farmer-father on the verge of being dispossessed of the ancestral farm moves on to the organization finally of all these farmers and others into Cooperatives. The bankers object. Big Business organizes against the Cooperatives and nearly carries the day in Washington with the signing of the Oil Codes, for Denny has organized oil, gasoline and restaurant Cooperatives, too. As the representative for the Cooperatives of his own eight states especially, our hero—with the help of a cabinet member we guess to be either one of two of our President's cabinet, and a Mrs. Mumford—finally prevails by the help of President Roosevelt, who "with his own hand" wrote in the clause that saved the day for the Cooperatives.

Of course, the "big shots" try to buy Denny, even offering to start him with the biggest oil monopoly at $25,000 per year. His ultimatum to Mr. Limey, the oil "king," is worth repeating here in part. Limey has just told Denny that, to stop Japan from getting the oil in Siberia, they are planning to have the United States make war on Japan. The youthful prophet flares forth:

"There are four millions of us who were in the war, and you can't put us back in, you and your associates. Neither can you put our little boys in, if we have any. We're through fighting for your commercial interests, had our bellies full. We'll not fight, if we know it, for oil, or silk, or chinaware, coal, iron or steel." (Page 232.)

A great book to give to members of the American Legion who are "almost persuaded" that they were engaged in a gigantic racket of mass murder for the financial benefit of the few, when they went across the seas in 1917-18!

Personally, we are all for the Cooperatives, but

wonder if they alone can be sufficient to stave off the fascist tendency in our country. We are confident the people will have to keep a keener eye on both Washington and our state capitals, so that the capitalist cannot get those laws passed that would strangle youthful Cooperatives. Dr. Jenkins makes clear that the price of Cooperatives, like liberty, is eternal vigilance.

A thrilling novel for all farmers and other victims of capitalism's breakdown! One could even set up a Cooperative with this volume as a guide. And the love stories! Denny's and Faith's romance, one of the two, is as thrilling and unique a love tale as we ever read.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Books Received

A YANKEE SAINT—JOHN HUMPHREY NOYES AND THE ONEIDA COMMUNITY. *By Robert Allerton Parker. 316 pp. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $3.75.*

THE FATHER OF MODERN INDIA—*Commemoration Volume of the Rammohun Roy Centenary Celebrations, 1933. Compiled and edited by Satis Chandra Chakravarti. 572 pp. Calcutta, India: Brahmo Mission Press. $1.75.*

WHAT GOD MEANS TO ME. *By Upton Sinclair. 140 pp. Pasadena, California, Station A: Upton Sinclair. $1.00.*

DEPRESSION ISLAND. *By Upton Sinclair. 124 pp. Pasadena, California, Station A: Upton Sinclair. $1.00.*

THE IMMUTABLE LAW. *By Jane Revere Burke. 118 pp. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. $1.00.*

THE MAPLE'S BRIDE AND OTHER ONE ACT PLAYS. *By Antoinette Scudder. 148 pp. Boston: Chapman & Grimes. $2.00.*

THE BAHA'I WORLD, VOL. V. *712 pp. Illustrated. New York: Baha'i Publishing Committee. $2.50.*

SOCIAL WORK YEAR BOOK, 1935. *Fred S. Hall, Editor. 698 pp. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. $4.00.*

Forthcoming Articles

Kagawa of Japan—*George Maychin Stockdale*

What Can We Learn from History?—*Reginald A. Reynolds*

China in Crisis—*Marshall Yu Hsing Fung*, as given to Professor Jerome Davis of Yale University

Death Comes for the Child—*Don West*

Sanctions: Are They Right or Wrong? — *John Haynes Holmes*

A Plowman's Way of the Cross—*Jay G. Sigmund*

Help Our Drive for More Readers of UNITY

By securing at least one new subscriber within the next thirty days!

Use the attached form.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No. .....

City ..... State .....

$3.00 for a year's subscription.
($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries.)

☐ Remittance enclosed.

☐ Send invoice.

Correspondence

Outlawry of War and Sanctions

Editor of UNITY:

I am in receipt of letters relative to the American Committee for the Outlawry of War. What is it doing today?

The Committee still exists and has never ceased to be active in the peace movement and especially in effectuating the Outlawry of War. It is true that the general type of treaty sponsored and advocated by our Committee has become part of the law of nations under the official title of the Pact of Paris. While thus the nations of the world have repudiated and renounced war and the use of force for the settlement of disputes and controversies, unfortunately the war system still lingers in the greed and ambition of too many signatory nations. Witness violations of this anti-war treaty in Asia, in South America, and now in Europe and Africa (by Italy operating on Ethiopia).

The fundamental philosophy of the Outlawry of War is at stake in the discussions and proposals relative to these infractions of the peace treaty, including the measures urged for collectively halting and punishing them. In short, the whole question of "aggressor" and "sanctions" is still with us. Our Committee feels, therefore, that there is as much need now for the support, expounding and interpretation of the Outlawry of War as there was originally for its crystallization into a treaty. Take the matter of an aggressor nation: A committee of the League of Nations something over a year ago reported to Geneva that it was unable after a year's deliberation to determine which was the aggressor between Bolivia and Paraguay. And no one seems to consider what kind of world we would have left if the aggressor were decided to be Great Britain, for example, or the United States! Would the commitments against an aggressor be carried out in such event and with what result? Yet, if we are really sincere and honest about designating and punishing the aggressor, the United States and Great Britain cannot escape except upon the ground that they are both angels.

I wish the Outlawry of War were really "a matter of history," that is, accomplished and honored. The question is very much alive. One of the great problems involved is whether we can trust the co-signatories of the Pact of Paris to keep the faith and to refrain from breaching their sacred commitments. Perhaps it was too much to expect war, the outlaw, to respect any

law or even its own signature. It takes time to demonstrate by actual operations that there is neither peace nor justice in the affirmative use of force, except the peace of exhaustion and the justice of spoils. This affirmative use of force is probably as ineffectual, where it is used as a punitive expedition (alias sanctions) as it was, despite our allied victory, in the World War. The situation calls for something other than a homeopathic remedy, that is, a war to cure war, or a war to end war. It is more of a subterfuge than a distinction to call the use of overwhelming sanctions (for example, as provided in Article XVI of the League Covenant) "collective defense," or some other euphemistic term. For it is perfectly plain that the perils of another world war are constantly implicit in the employment of sanctions. Nor does Article XVI provide that the member nations of the League shall *first* employ *economic* sanctions again an "aggressor," and then if that does not work, to bring into play *military* sanctions. No such distinction is made; both types of sanctions are provided for in the same Article.

Moreover, the threat of sanctions, illustrated by the prohibition of oil, which first allowed a thirty day breathing spell (for oil), and then when the time came and war was threatened if such economic sanction were enforced, granted another long breathing spell, deserves rather the name of "sanctimonious sanctions." For, if the purpose of sanctions is to stop Italy, and the League of Nations proceeds to employ them, and if it is a sensible thing to do, why make fine distinctions between types of punitive expeditions and sanctions? Why stop in the middle of the good work? No, the road to international sanctions is the road to war.

Until the nations are willing to honor their treaties, to keep sacred their plighted word to use only pacific means, we simply must realize that they are faced with the only alternative to aloofness which exists: to wit, war in its naked and ugly sense. Halfway measures are only war-irritants. An engaging pseudonym for war is merely a process of cruel self-deception.

America has offered Europe the complete abandonment of war, the logical corollary of which is drastic general reduction of armaments. But many European nations, despite their ratification of the anti-war treaty, continue to increase armaments and to engage in wars. How, then, can one say that the Outlawry of War is an accomplished fact?

SALMON O. LEVINSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

Without Aid of Clergy

Editor of UNITY:

Tennyson wrote, "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." In the metaphysical domain each soul must make its own decision as to verity and potency; this cannot be translated into a material graph for the human eye, and thus it is set beyond profitable discussion or controversy. That the Constitutional Convention was a gathering of prayerful men is another historical legend of the Weems' type which has enlivened many pages of our literature. As President Wilson intimated—these delegates were men who knew what they wanted and how to get it. They were appointed for the sole purpose of the necessary work of strengthening the Articles of Confederation, but went outside of their ticket to frame a new code, to suit their own point of view, in secret session. Two New York delegates, in disapproval of this method, went home and reported to Governor Clinton; this left the other delegate, Alexander Hamilton, minus a vote, but his sinister Tory influence was strong.

As the hectic days rolled by, altercations grew hot between the majority favoring "property rights" and those who aimed to establish equal opportunity and application of natural rights for all. Dr. Franklin, then governor of Pennsylvania and in the declining years of his honored career, aghast at the naked exposure of unrepublican principles, moved that at all future gatherings they invoke the Divine blessing each morning. Out of respect to the Venerable Sage it was received with decorum, but in discussion it was said that no funds had been appropriated for a chaplain. Hamilton feared ribald criticism if they started at that late day. It is also reported that he said, off-stage, that they desired no foreign influence in the matter (which reported statement may have been also, to use a euphemism, a "legend"). A so-called respectable committee was given the matter in charge—and never reported. Governor Randolph, of Virginia, suggested that they attend Divine worship in a body the next Sunday, for the possible means of grace which might follow. Let each read for himself George Bancroft, historian, on the Convention. Many apocryphal statements will be issued in this campaign.

When after many days the Document was made public the young nation was in a mental turmoil, for the African slave trade was continued, and a new privilege of extradition and recapture of runaways to free soil was enacted, besides other principles for which the country was unprepared. If the Divine blessing on their deliberations had been faithfully asked for, might the debatable document have reached the height of the best thought of the day? Futile conjecture—but only the great body of the clergy of ante-bellum days, or your regular man-eating monopolist, would have the assurance to ask the blessing of a Just God upon any form of human slavery.

WINIFRED B. COSSETTE

Cambridge, Mass.

Our Sacred Cows

Editor of UNITY:

There is a story of a little girl who sat with her father at the breakfast table one morning, enjoying with him the tasty meal the wife and mother had set before them. By and by the little girl remarked: "The biscuits are good this morning, ain't they, papa?" "Yes." replied the father indifferently. "I knowed they were," persisted the child. "How did you know, dear?" inquired the father. To which the child made the unconsciously withering reply, "Because you didn't say nothing about them."

In the long years during which I have been a reader of the columns of UNITY, the editorial "biscuits" have been good so many, many times, without any mention of the fact on my part where such mention could reach the writer, or writers, thereof, that I am reluctant to begin such direct comment by expressing my dissent. But at least I have not been guilty of the offense which the little girl laid implicitly against her father, that his silence was only in evidence when the

"biscuits" got by his usual complaint. I think I have not complained, if this *is* complaint, before.

But I have to confess that the editorials in your issue of February 3, entitled, "The Supreme Court and Democracy" and "The Supreme Court and Liberty," are profoundly disappointing and disturbing to me. The fact, which I think can hardly be disputed, that these editorials are substantially such as to be avidly acceptable to the American Liberty League, and all like reactionaries, even to the limit of the Hearst press, may not be conclusive against them, for even these parties have some things in common with the world in which UNITY lives. Yet I like not accompanying the American Fascist outfit at the point of issues whereon their chief reliance lies. If the Supreme Court and the Constitution are not the Sacred Cows of the whole reactionary agglomeration in these United States, then I do not know where their temple and altar will be found. No deadlier superstition exists among us than this Baal worship of courts and codes, high and low; and by this worship a Hitlerism portentously as evil as that which has Germany in its grip today is rapidly advancing upon us.

I speak out of no slight acquaintance with the workings of legalism in the United States as I have observed them with more than ordinary intimacy, for a minister, through nearly half a century now. During my ministry in Salem, Oregon, in the early nineties of the last century, I acted as unofficial, and financially unrewarded, chaplain of the State Penitentiary there. I was no "radical" in those days, except as I have always been on the side of the unprivileged and disinherited, and have always been stirred to wrath by hypocrisy and iniquity in high places. For a time I seriously thought of giving myself to specialization in penology, and devoting my ministry to prison work. But although I was far from an indulgent sentimentalist toward the prisoners, overhard in my judgment of them generally, I would say now that I was so outraged by the mockery of justice which prevailed in the proceedings against them that to spare myself emotional crucifixion beyond my ability to bear I gladly escaped from the contact by removal to another pastorate less involved in court affairs.

However, there came a much closer contact with prison life later, when I was myself an inmate of the City Prison in Los Angeles during the World War. I have never allowed myself to dwell with bitterness upon what I witnessed, from the very inside, of the workings of legal procedure in relation to the vags and drunkards and petty criminals whose experience I fellowshipped there. I do not need to dwell upon them. There was more devastating exhibit yet in the infamous insanity to which the courts yielded, and in which they took a leading part, not only while the war was on, but for long afterwards, at the point of persecution of war objectors, and more especially with respect to the outrageous inquisition carried on against the I. W. W. I was near enough to this, throughout the whole area of the Pacific Coast, to have my last shred of homage toward the courts blown to shreds. Had this not been so, in relation to the more than one hundred men sent to the California penitentiaries by mad and maudlin court procedure that was utterly wanting in decency, to say nothing of justice, during the I. W. W. pogrom under cover of Constitution and court, what I have witnessed since of the proceedings against labor under the same allegedly legal pattern would have completed the work. The vast furore which has been raised against what is lyingly called "Criminal Syndicalism" is an openly diaphanous disguise for a *criminal legalism* as realistic as the other is pretended, and as revolting, when the progress of the past five centuries is in view, as the doings of the courts in the Middle Ages.

Next to the Capitalist System itself, this which I have justly named Criminal Legalism is the most serious menace in the American life of our day. In their ordinary fields the courts are characterized by a stupidity of procedure; a dilatoriness which acts as an effective deterrent to the securing of justice by any except those who can afford to hire legal talent of the first order (more likely to be hired to defeat justice than to maintain it) and an evasion of common sense dealings within the whole area of reasonable consideration whereby quick and satisfactory settlement can be made, which manifests in the fact that nowhere does legal procedure protect common life and property so poorly as in the United States. On the other hand, outside of openly Fascist countries, nowhere are class interest and special privilege so sure of the Courts, even to the Supreme Court itself, as under our Constitution in the hands of its present guardians. "The law is made for the lawyers," remarked a member of the bar who could by no means be accused of any radicalism. Another, connected with one of the chief legal firms in one of our large cities, and successful to a point of having no occasion for personal complaint, remarked with equal conciseness and frankness: "The law is a racket." It is; all things considered, the most expensive and obstructive racket in our country today.

This is the real issue in America this year, whether President Roosevelt has the courage to deal with it frankly and fearlessly, or not. He probably will not. The man who lost his railway ticket and, when the conductor remarked indulgently, "Oh well, I know you had it!" answered promptly, "But if I can't find it, I don't know where I am going and won't know where to get off," has his analogue in the White House now. The President doesn't know where to get off, though he is clever in high degree in getting on. But the labor world is awaking to the fact that the courts are in the hands of the enemy, and that no polite dealing with their subservience to a tradition which special privilege has built up through centuries is going to do the work of deliverance for the people. Congress itself is the weak thing that it is in no small degree because it is an aggregation of lawyers, accustomed to piddling procrastinations and to yielding to pressures where most effectively applied.

Suffer just this word with respect to the so-called "raid on the treasury" by the veterans' organizations, and the rising tide of the Townsend propaganda. May I ask two questions? Who made the veterans, anyway? Are the war-mongers to build a Frankenstein and then whine their wits away because their Frankenstein torments his creators? The American Legion is the legitimate, the inevitable fruit of the Conscription Act and of war itself. Let those who prepare for war at incalculable cost to the people take their medicine, of which they have had but a few drops yet.

And as to the Townsend Plan. What of the more than twenty million people on relief in the United States, a country which could feed, and clothe, and house humanity if put to its full productive power?

What plans of proposed relief can be as irrational as this condition out of which they come?

Los Gatos, California. ROBERT WHITAKER.

[The answer to Dr. Whitaker's contention, so far as it concerns our editorial discussion of the Supreme Court, came on the very day this letter was received, in the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court invalidating the Louisiana (Huey Long) law-taxing newspaper advertisements. This law was a gross violation of the constitutional principle of free press, and thus a long step toward Fascism in this country. The decision is one which is being hailed everywhere by liberals and radicals with enthusiastic rejoicing. In this case, in other words, the liberals and radicals believe in the Supreme Court and its power to declare legislation unconstitutional. But how can they believe in it in this case and not in every case, even in such cases where decision may go against them? The real onus of the liberal complaint against the Supreme Court is that liberals want the Court to be consistently and unanimously in agreement with *them*. The Court's crime, in the view of the liberals who denounce it, is not that the Court declares laws unconstitutional, but that on occasion it declares laws they like unconstitutional. But that's the fate of democracy. Under freedom men disagree, and decision goes wrong as well as right; and judges in courts are like the rest of us in this regard. The real trouble with liberals and radicals on this Supreme Court issue is that they are intolerant. They insist that everybody shall agree with them, the Supreme Court included, under penalty of extinction. But that's Fascism!

We return to our original contention that courts and laws and constitutions are instruments of democracy. They work well and ill, they take us forward and sometimes backward—but that's what democracy is. We see no alternative except the abolition of courts and laws and constitutions, and people who want that are commended to Adolf Hitler. For the life of us we can't see why anybody should be worried about decrees of unconstitutionality when the Constitution can be amended any time to cover anything the people may desire. Over such amendments, we would point out, the Supreme Court has no authority. If this nation wants an AAA, or a NRA, or anything else, even a dictatorship, let them say so in a constitutional amendment. The way is open! EDITOR.]

The Field

(*Continued from page 2*)

fession receiving contraceptive information and supplies, but rather against the unscrupulous distribution through the mails of this material to laymen. But, as long as the Federal laws remain as they are, reputable physicians, hospitals, and medical schools cannot afford to run the risk of getting into trouble or receiving unfavorable publicity.

Approximately a thousand organizations are on record in support of changing the Federal law governing birth control.

—National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control.
Washington, D. C.

Germany and the Jews

Nazi Charges and the Official Figures

Nazi propaganda abroad alleges three main reasons for the anti-Jewish policy of the party—

Almost all Communists, or at least the Communist leaders, were Jews.

After the world war hundreds of thousands of East European Jews with a low standard of morals and culture invaded Germany like a swarm of locusts, devouring the wealth of the country.

The Jews in Germany monopolized the professions of law and medicine, had a stranglehold on the Civil Service and the universities, and left no breathing-space for non-Jewish Germans in cultural life; for example, on the stage, in literature, or on the concert platform.

Wirtschaft und Statistik, the official statistical organ of the German Government, has now published a special study on the Jews in Germany based on the results of the censuses of 1910, 1925 and 1933, which reduces these allegations to their true proportions. Instead of hundreds of thousands of East European Jews these official statistics reveal that between 1910 (four years before the war) and 1925 (seven years after the war) the total number of Jewish immigrants into Germany—and these immigrants included both East and West European Jews—did not exceed 31,000. Between 1925 and 1933 9,000 of them had left the country again. There were thus no more than a net 22,000 foreign Jewish immigrants in twenty-three years among a population of 67,000,000. The devouring hordes are a myth.

What about the monopolizing of the professions, the stranglehold on the universities, the overwhelming influence of the Jews in cultural life? After the emancipation of the Jews in Germany about a hundred years ago, the Civil Service and many of the learned professions remained closed to them. Jewish intellectuals could only become doctors, lawyers, or journalists. Thus the percentage of Jews in these walks of life was higher than the percentage of Jews among the whole German population. But since the Jews had to compete freely and enjoyed no legal or extra-legal privileges there is surely no cause for complaint.

But Nazi propaganda speaks of a Jewish monopoly and complains that non-Jewish Germans were unable to find a place in these professions. A glance at the official statistics proves the contrary. The highest Jewish percentage was among the lawyers (there is no distinction between barristers and solicitors in Germany), amounting to 16.25. The percentage of Jewish doctors was 10.88. Of the State-appointed lawyers (judges, magistrates, and State attorneys) no more than 2.76 per cent were Jews. What about the stranglehold of the Jews on the universities? The percentage here was 2.64. The percentage of Jews among the teachers in the elementary and secondary schools was no higher than 0.53. And in cultural life? The figures show that 5.61 per cent of the producers in the theatres were Jews, 3 per cent of the actors and dancers, 2.04 per cent of the musicians and singers, 2.5 per cent of the booksellers, 2.44 per cent of the painters and sculptors, and 5.05 per cent of editors and authors. This is neither a stranglehold nor a monopoly.

The statistics do not, of course, contain anything about Jewish participation in the Communist party, but here also the Nazi allegations are completely unfounded. In those districts where a large number of Jews used to live, the Communist vote in democratic times was particularly low. And of the hundred Communist members in the last freely elected Reichstag only two were of Jewish origin and only one of the two was of any importance in the party.—A Correspondent in *The Manchester Guardian Weekly*.